

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The drawings were objected to for various instances of mislabeling of the reference characters. The Applicant submits herewith thirteen (13) sheets of replacement drawings to overcome these objections, as well as to formalize the remaining drawings. The replacement sheets are designated as FIGS. 1A-11. The Applicant submits that no new matter has been entered by the attached thirteen replacement sheets of FIGS. 1A-11.

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

The present application includes pending claims 1-31, all of which have been rejected. By this Amendment, claims 1-5, 8-15, 18-21, and 30-31 have been amended, as set forth above, to further clarify the language used in these claims and to further prosecution of the present application. The Applicant respectfully submits that the claims define patentable subject matter.

Claims 1-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,553,100, issued to Chen, et al. (hereinafter, Chen). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections at least based on the following remarks.

I. INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The Examiner states that the listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. The Applicant points out that it is believed that none of the references cited in the cross-reference section (or any other section that incorporates an application by reference) of the present application qualify as prior art to the present application. In instances where a cross-reference section was used (or any other section which incorporates an application by reference), the Applicant points out that the Examiner was simply being notified of applications that may be considered related to the present application (e.g., including at least one common inventor and/or common disclosure with the present application). Therefore, it is believed that none of

the references cited in the cross-reference section (or in any other section that incorporates by reference) need be cited in an IDS.

II. SPECIFICATION

The specification was objected to for various informalities. The Applicant has amended the specification, as set forth above, to overcome these objections.

The specification was also objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. The Office Action further states:

Correction of the following is required: The specification does not distinctly define the characteristics of each of the claimed processors of Claim 31: "a media processing system processor, a media management system processor, a computer processor, a media exchange software processor and a media peripheral processor" (paragraphs [13] & [116]). Without further disclosure as to the distinctness of each claimed processor in Claim 31, each claimed processor will be treated as indistinguishable and therefore the broadest reasonable interpretation of a processor will be used in the interpretation of Claim 31.

See Office Action at page 5. The Applicant respectfully disagrees and points out that the various types of processors stated in claim 31 are stated in paragraph 116 of the specification. In addition, the Applicant submits that it is known in the art what the terms "media peripheral", "computer", and a "storage system" mean. Therefore, the Applicant submits that there is no need for further clarification of the terms "media peripheral processor", "computer processor", and a "storage system processor." With

regard to the terms “media processing system (MPS)” and “media exchange software (MES)”, the Applicant submits that the specification is sufficiently informative as to the meaning of these terms. For example, the Examiner is referred to Figures 1A-3 and the corresponding description in paragraphs 30-84 for additional information on what is meant by “media processing system (MPS)” and “media exchange software (MES)”. Obviously, a “media processing system (MPS) processor” and a “media exchange software (MES) processor” would be a processor that performs one or more of the functionalities of a “media processing system (MPS)” and a “media exchange software (MES)”, as already described in the specification.

The Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to the Specification be withdrawn.

III. DRAWINGS

The drawings were objected to for various instances of mislabeling of the reference characters. The Applicant submits herewith thirteen (13) sheets of replacement drawings to overcome these objections, as well as to formalize the remaining drawings. The replacement sheets are designated as FIGS. 1A-11. The Applicant submits that no new matter has been entered by the attached thirteen replacement sheets of FIGS. 1A-11.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

IV. Chen Does Not Anticipate Claims 1-31

The Applicant now turns to the rejection of claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chen. With regard to the anticipation rejections under 102(e), MPEP 2131 states that “[a] claim is anticipated only if **each and every element** as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” See Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) at 2131 (internal citation omitted). Furthermore, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” See id. (internal citation omitted).

Without conceding that Chen qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), the Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as follows.

A. Rejection of Independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

With regard to the rejection of independent claim 1 under 102(e), the Applicant submits that Chen does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of “routing said generated message to a location that is remote from said first geographic location, based on a prior authorization level established by a user command,” as recited by the Applicant in independent claim 1.

The Office Action states the following:

With respect to Claim 1, the claimed "receiving an alert from a first device coupled to the communication network" is met by Chen et al. that teach the use of an intelligent processor (100) in receiving an alert from

alarm event detectors (510,520) via a network (200) (Abstract; Fig.1&5; col. 1, lines 17-19; col. 1, lines 54-55; col.2; lines 27-32; col.5, lines 51-54; & col.9, lines 47-48). The claimed "generating within a home; a message corresponding to said received alert; and displaying said generated message on a television screen within said home" is met by Chen et al. that teach the generation & transmittal by an intelligent processor (100), located on-premise, of an alert message to a user's television (310,320) (Fig.5; col. 1, lines 61-67; col.6, lines 40-48; col.8, lines 46-53; & col.9, lines 54-57).

See Office Action at page 7. Chen discloses an intelligent alerting system that receives a notification and alerts end-users via one or more devices (on-premises or off-premises devices). Chen's system also includes a processor (100 in FIG. 1) that determines whether any of these devices are active for purposes of communicating the alert. See Chen at col. 1, lines 17-29. Referring to FIGS. 2-3 of Chen, the Applicant points out that the processor 100 uses an alert destination determination device 170, which determines whether or not to transmit the alert to an on-premise or off-premise device. More specifically, Chen discloses that if no acknowledgement is received in response to an alert transmitted to on-premise devices (330 and 340), the processor 100 attempts to alert the user at the off-premises devices (410, 420, and 430). See *id.* at col. 4, lines 51-59. Furthermore, the alert destination determination device 170 may use profiles that indicate where the user can be reached by a given device. See *id.* at col. 7, lines 57-65. In this regard, Chen does not disclose any routing of a generated message (notification) to a location that is remote from the first geographic location (i.e., where the alert is received at), **based on a prior authorization level established by a**

user command. In fact, Chen does not disclose that the notification routing is in any way influenced or based on any user commands. The Applicant notes that Chen's user profile used with regard to device 170 simply stores pre-determined user locations and it has nothing to do with setting up authorization levels established by a user command.

The Applicant maintains that Chen does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of "routing said generated message to a location that is remote from said first geographic location, based on a prior authorization level established by a user command," as recited by the Applicant in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Chen and is allowable. Independent claims 11 and 21 are similar in many respects to the method disclosed in independent claim 1. Therefore, the Applicant submits that independent claims 11 and 21 are also allowable over the reference cited in the Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.

B. Rejection of Dependent Claims 2-10, 12-20, and 22-31

Based on at least the foregoing, the Applicant believes the rejection of independent claims 1, 11, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Chen has been overcome and requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Additionally, claims 2-10, 12-20, and 22-31 depend from independent claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively, and are, consequently, also respectfully submitted to be allowable.

Application № 10/675,448
Reply to Office Action of January 9, 2008

The Applicant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 2-10, 12-20, and 22-31.

CONCLUSION

Based on at least the foregoing, the Applicant believes that all claims 1-31 are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner disagrees, the Applicant respectfully requests a telephone interview, and requests that the Examiner telephone the undersigned Attorney at (312) 775-8176.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd., Account No. 13-0017.

A Notice of Allowability is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 9, 2008

/Ognyan I. Beremski/

Ognyan Beremski, Esq.
Registration No. 51,458
Attorney for Applicant

MCANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.
500 WEST MADISON STREET, 34TH FLOOR
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60661
(312) 775-8000

/ OIB